



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,272	02/14/2000	Mikko Maattanen	297-009192-US(PAR)	6323

7590

09/05/2003

Clarence A Green
Perman & Green
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2681

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,272

Applicant(s)

MAATTANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D Nguyen

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 22-25 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 8, 11-13, 16, 17, 19-21, 26 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2681

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 06/13/2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-28 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-10, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859).

Regarding claims 1, 5, 7, 9-10, 28, Jonsson et al. disclose a cellular telephone that comprises a printed circuit board 50, a keypad 30, a display 40, outer cover consisting of two parts (20 & 22), and a frame construction into which the above parts are mechanically coupled (see FIG. 1 and 2 and Col. 3, lines 19-35). Jonsson et al. fail to disclose a reader for a detachable memory module. Desblancs et al. teaches a mobile phone with a memory card reader (see FIG. 1

Art Unit: 2681

and Col. 2, lines 24-25). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to include in Jonsson et al.'s telephone a memory card reader as disclosed in Desblancs et al. since that would allow the phone to receive memory card.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859) and further in view of Kivela (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,189).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Jonsson et al. in view of Desblancs et al. fails to disclose that frame construction defines a vibrational alarm device compartment for housing a vibrating alarm device separately attachable to the frame construction. Kivela teaches a vibratory module (see FIG. 9 and Col. 6, line 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify telephone of the combination so that frame construction defines a vibrational alarm device compartment for housing a vibrational alarm device separately attachable to the frame construction as disclosed in Kivela since that would provide flexibility to users.

Claims 14-15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859) and further in view of Fuhrmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0057792).

Regarding claims 14-15, 18, the combination of Jonsson et al. in view of Desblancs et al. fails to disclose that the keypad is a separately assembled stack of layers comprising a front cover part defining a set of key openings, an elastic keymat with a protruding key bulb corresponding to each key opening in front cover part, and a dome sheet with an elastically

Art Unit: 2681

deformable conductive dome corresponding to each key bulb in elastic keymat. Fuhrmann et al. teach a keypad assembly comprising a front cover part 19 defining a set of key openings, an elastic keymat 24 with a protruding key bulb corresponding to each key opening in front cover part, and a dome sheet with an elastically deformable conductive dome corresponding to each key bulb in elastic keymat (see FIG. 5 and pages 2 and 3). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify telephone of the combination so that keypad is a separately assembled stack of layers comprising a front cover part defining a set of key openings, an elastic keymat with a protruding key bulb corresponding to each key opening in front cover part, and a dome sheet with an elastically deformable conductive dome corresponding to each key bulb in elastic keymat as disclosed in Fuhrmann et al. since that would give endurance to the keypad.

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859) and further in view of Halttunen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,166).

Regarding claims 22-24, the combination of Jonsson et al. in view of Desblancs et al. fails to disclose a bottom plate for conveying light into the liquid crystal display. Halttunen et al. teaches a liquid crystal display device comprising a ground plate between an LCD and an EL panel serving as a backlight source for the LCD (see Col. 1, line 56 –col. 2, line 5). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to include a bottom plate for conveying light into the liquid crystal display as disclosed in Halttunen et al. to the telephone of the combination since that would provide convenience for users operating phone in the dark.

Art Unit: 2681

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,772) in view of Desblancs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,859) and Beiswenger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,911).

Regarding claim 25, Jonsson et al. fail to disclose the display comprising an elastomeric conductor arrangement. Beiswenger et al. teach that the drivers typically connect to the liquid crystal display terminals through a conductive elastomeric connector (see Col. 1, lines 58-61). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to use conductive elastomeric connector as disclosed in Beiswenger et al. for the telephone of the combination since it provides endurance to the connection.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-4, 8, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 26-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3283. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2681

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 703-305-4778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-6750.

HN
Aug. 25, 2003


SINH TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER